UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,471	11/20/2003	Rathinavelu Chengalvarayan	9432-000249	1036

27572 7590 07/28/2005

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER	
CHOJNACKI, MELLISSA M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2164	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/718,471	CHENGALVARAYAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mellissa M. Chojnacki	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/20/2003.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The specification is object too because:

1. The abstract contains the phrase "is provided" in line 1. The abstract should not contain "provided ". Correction is required.

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims1-2, 7-8, 12, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,181).

As to claim 1, Li et al. teaches an indexing system for tagging a media stream (See abstract; column 1, lines 32-37; column 4, lines 4-6, where "tagging" is read on "annotation") comprising:

at least one input that provides information for defining at least one tag (See column 1, lines 32-47);

a tagging system for assigning the at least one tag to the media (See column 1, lines 32-37); and

a collaborative tag handling system for dispatching the at least one tag to a plurality of individuals for review (See column 4, lines 16-20).

As to claim 2, Li et al. teaches wherein at least one input comprises at least one speech input, and the tagging system includes a speech recognition system (See column 5, lines 19-47).

As to claim 7, Li et al. teaches wherein the at least one tag includes a pointer for associating the at least one tag to a timeline of the media (See Li et al., column 4, lines 56-64).

As to claim 8, Li et al. as modified, teaches further comprising a tag analysis system comparing the information from each of the at least one input to determine and correct inconsistencies therein (See column 5, lines 48-52; column 6, lines 10-20; column 7, lines 46-65).

As to claim 12, Li et al. teaches wherein the at least one tag includes a label identifying a source of the at least one tag (See column 10, lines 28-35).

As to claim 16, Li et al. teaches an indexing system for tagging a media stream (See abstract; column 1, lines 32-37; column 4, lines 4-6, where "tagging" is read on "annotation") comprising:

at least one input providing information to define at least one tag (See column 1, lines 32-47);

a tagging system for assigning the at least one tag to the media (See column 1, lines 32-37); a tag database for storing the at least one tag and the media (See column 1, lines 6-10, lines 32-37);

a tag analysis system comparing the information from each of the at least one input to determine and correct inconsistencies therein (See column 5, lines 48-52; column 6, lines 10-20; column 7, lines 46-65); and

a retrieval system for searching the tag database by analyzing the tags and returning results (See column 4, lines 16-20).

As to claim 19, Li et al. teaches wherein the retrieval system uses a probabilistic retrieval model (See column 5, lines 48-52; column 6, lines 10-20; column 7, lines 46-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3-6, 11, 14-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,181), in view of Bennett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,256).

As to claim 3, Li et al. does not teach wherein the speech recognition system includes a translation component that translates multiple languages into a common language, and the common language is stored in the at least one tag.

Bennett et al. teaches networked stenographic system with real-time speech to text conversion for down-line display and annotation (See abstract), in which he teaches wherein the speech recognition system includes a translation component that translates multiple languages into a common language, and the common language is stored in the at least one tag (See Figure 5b; column 16, lines 46-67; column 17, lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Li et al., to include wherein the speech recognition system includes a translation component that translates multiple languages into a common language, and the common language is stored in the at least one tag.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Li et al., by the teachings of Bennett et al. because wherein the speech recognition system includes a translation component that translates multiple languages into a common language, and the common language is stored in the at least one tag would clearly improve the system for indexing and retrieving media content (See Li et al., column 1, lines 23-29).

As to claim 4, Li et al. as modified, teaches wherein the speech recognition system stores multiple languages within the at least one tag (See Bennett et al., Figure 5b; column 16, lines 46-67; column 17, lines 1-3).

As to claim 5, Li et al. as modified, teaches further comprising tag information feedback to a user for editing, deleting, and adding the information in the at least one tag (See Bennett et al., column 20, lines 6-13; column 23, lines 55-62; column 28, lines 45-55).

As to claim 6, Li et al. as modified, teaches wherein the at least one tag is comprised of a plurality of fields, each of the fields storing information from the at least one input (See Bennett et al., column 7, lines 56-59; column 13, lines 30-33).

As to claim 11, Li et al. as modified, teaches wherein the at least one tag includes a label identifying a language of the at least one tag (See Bennett et al., Figure 5b; column 16, lines 46-67; column 17, lines 1-3).

As to claim 14, Li et al. teaches wherein the at least one individual comprises an individual that provides the at least one input (See Li et al., column 4, lines 16-20; also see Bennett et al., column 7, lines 1-19).

As to claim 15, Li et al. as modified, teaches wherein the tagging system includes an encryption mechanism to encrypt the at least one tag (See Bennett et al., column 26, lines 39-45, lines 56-61).

As to claim 17, Li et al. as modified, teaches wherein the retrieval system uses a Boolean retrieval model (See Bennett et al., column 19, lines 43-49).

7. Claim 9, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,181), in view of Ebert (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0144985).

As to claim 9, Li et al. does not teach wherein the at least one input includes at least one sensor for creating an attribute in the tag.

Ebert teaches bi-directional data flow in a real time tracking system (See abstract), in which he teaches wherein the at least one input includes at least one sensor for creating an attribute in the tag (See abstract; paragraph 008).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Li et al., to include wherein the at least one input includes at least one sensor for creating an attribute in the tag.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Li et al., by the teachings of Ebert because wherein the at least one input includes at least one sensor for creating an attribute in the tag would clearly improve the system for indexing and retrieving media content (See Li et al., column 1, lines 23-29).

8. Claim 10, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,181), in view of Jain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,444).

As to claim 10, Li et al. does not teach wherein the at least one tag includes a confidence value associated with the attribute.

Jain et al. teaches video cataloger system with extensibility (See abstract), in which he teaches wherein the at least one tag includes a confidence value associated with the attribute (See column 9, lines 18-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Li et al., to include wherein the at least one tag includes a confidence value associated with the attribute.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Li et al., by the teachings of Jain et al. because wherein the at least one tag includes a confidence value associated with the attribute would clearly improve the system for indexing and retrieving media content (See Li et al., column 1, lines 23-29).

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,181), in view of Srivastava et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,922).

As to claim 13, Li et al. does not teach wherein the at least one tag includes an attribute for assigning a copyright designation therein.

Srivastava et al. teaches a system for collecting, transforming and managing media metadata (See abstract), in which he teaches wherein the at least one tag includes an attribute for assigning a copyright designation therein (See column 2, lines 28-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Li et al., to include wherein the at least one tag includes an attribute for assigning a copyright designation therein.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Li et al., by the teachings of Srivastava et al. because wherein the at least one tag includes an attribute for assigning a copyright designation therein would clearly improve the system for indexing and retrieving media content (See Li et al., column 1, lines 23-29).

10. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,181), in view of Lui et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0105589).

As to claim 18, Li et al. does not teach wherein the retrieval system uses a vector retrieval model.

Lui et al. teaches a system for collecting, transforming and managing media metadata (See abstract), in which he teaches wherein the retrieval system uses a vector retrieval model (See paragraph 0067).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Li et al., to include wherein the retrieval system uses a vector retrieval model.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Li et al., by the teachings of Lui et al. because wherein the retrieval system uses a vector retrieval model would clearly improve the system for indexing and retrieving media content (See Li et al., column 1, lines 23-29).

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mellissa M. Chojnacki whose telephone number is (571) 272-4076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C. Rones

CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

July 24, 2005
Mmc